

1  
2  
3                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4                   **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
5

6     ALEXANDER RODRIGUEZ,  
7       Plaintiff,  
8     v.  
9     UNICITY INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
10      Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-00754-GMN-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 34]

11       Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend case management deadlines. Docket  
12 No. 34.

13       A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a  
14 showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns  
15 on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence.  
16 *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). “The diligence  
17 obligation is ongoing.” *Morgal v. Maricopa Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 284 F.R.D. 452, 460 (D.  
18 Ariz. 2012). The showing of diligence is measured by the conduct displayed throughout the entire  
19 period of time already allowed. *See Muniz v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 731 F.Supp.2d 961, 967  
20 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (quoting *Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 605, 607 (E.D. Cal. 1999)). When  
21 diligence has not been shown in support of an extension request, “the inquiry should end.”  
22 *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609.

23       In the instant stipulation, the parties seek to extend case management deadlines by sixty  
24 days. Docket No. 34. The justification provided for this request is that “[t]he parties are hopeful  
25 they may be able to resolve the dispute during the [ENE] and seek an extension to the discovery  
26 deadlines to allow the parties to engage in confidential settlement discussions before expending  
27 significant funds to conduct discovery.” Docket No. 34 at 3. However, the parties’ assertion that  
28 additional time is needed to engage in settlement discussions does not establish good cause for the

1 extension sought. *See Williams v. James River Grp. Inc.*, 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1181 (D. Nev.  
2 2022) (“As such, it is well-settled that the existence of settlement talks or the potential for  
3 alternative dispute resolution is not, standing alone, sufficient to establish good cause for an  
4 extension of the case management deadlines.”). Further, the parties have conducted virtually no  
5 affirmative discovery. *See Docket No. 34 at 2*. Therefore, the Court cannot find diligence.

6 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the parties’ stipulation without prejudice. Docket No.  
7 34.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: October 2, 2025

10  
11 Nancy J. Koppe  
12 United States Magistrate Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

